DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 639 HE 002 627

TITLE Women in Virginia Higher Education.
INSTITUTION New University Conference, Hampton, Va. Peninsula Chapter.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; *Faculty; Females; Feminism; Higher Education; Legal Responsibility; Personnel Data; Public Education; Public Policy; *Social Discrimination; State Colleges; Statewide Planning; *Women Professors

ABSTRACT

This document explores how Virginia higher education perpetuates stereotypic social roles, the evolution of sexually segregated schools, the current evidences of sexual discrimination towards faculty, staff and students, the State Council of Higher Education's 1967 plan for higher education, the status of Virginia higher education under the law and the composition of university boards, councils and administrations. In Virginia, each college and university seem to have been designed to serve a specific slice of the college-bound population, with as little overlap as possible among the institutions. Separate public women's colleges prepare women for traditional female professions. Virginia is one of four southern states that maintains sexually segregated public schools of higher education. Three exist now, and only recently three others became coed. Staffing patterns across institutions reveal differential hiring of the sexes; women are found concentrated in the lower ranks; women's average salary was lower for each rank at both 2-year and 4-year institutions. State female institutions enroll 11% of the state's students, yet receive 6% of the state funds. In coed institutions, differences in the sexual composition of the student body suggest that women are excluded from prestigious institutions. Specific recommendations for changes are made. History and literature course plans which focus on women appear in the appendix. (LR)

ED056639

WOMEN IN VIRGINIA HIGHER EDUCATION

WOMEN IN VIRGINIA HIGHER EDUCATION
WOMEN IN VIRGINIA HIGHER EDUCATION
WOMEN IN VIRGINIA HIGHER EDUCATION

a report

prepared by
the
Peninsula
Chapter,
New University
Conference
1971

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 002 627

PENINSULA CHAPTER
THE NEW UNIVERSITY CONFERENCE

This report on sexism in Virginia's public colleges and universities is the product of the collective effort of members of the Peninsula Chapter, New University Conference. When we began we were shocked to realize that we were almost totally ignorant of the position of women in the state's higher education system and of many other aspects of the institutional system within which we work or study. We think our situation was not unique; that most students and faculty members are uninformed about the purposes of Virginia education, the classes and groups it serves, the different ways people are channeled into occupations and classes by the schools, and the remarkable differences in the quality of the education offered at the elite and mass colleges. So, we decided to share the preliminary results of our research with friends around the state.

There are two main reasons for doing this. First, even such preliminary materia may be useful in self-education, in group work on education or women, and in helping us make contact with those interested in opening up Virginia's college system to serve all the people. Second, we hope people around the state, particularly those who study or teach at state colleges, will make their own contributions to completing this report. We have worked mainly with the publications of the State Council of Higher Education, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and other public sources. We are sure much more useful and accurate material is available to those directly involved at schools which discriminate against women. For instance, the impact of nepotism rules can only be documented by gathering instances of wives who reside in a university community but are denied employment. Our material on the treatment of women staff is very weak. We need to know more about actual wages, unions, work-loads and responsibilities, promotions, and need for childcare facilities--all information which must be collected college by college by those on the spot. The only statewide data published on students is that on admissions. We need to compile information about social rules, the need for birth control and abortion counseling, the channeling of women students into certain fields, covert discrimination in recruitment, scholarship awards, and placement. We would particularly welcome communication with Black women students, faculty, and staff at any public Virginia colleges. None of the published data was very useful in understanding their problems.

All people interested in cooperating through correcting our errors, adding to our information, or suggesting new or different recommendations should contact:

Peninsula Chapter, New University Conference
Post Office Box 613
Hampton, Virginia 23369

The chapter is also working on several other reports which will be, with this one, part of an overall study of tracking in the state's higher education system. We are now working on racism, financing higher education, and the class bias of the state plan for expanding community colleges and universities. We welcome the cooperation of anyone interested in these subjects.

February, 1971

WOMEN IN VIRGINIA HIGHER EDUCATION

Peninsula Chapter, New University Conference

March, 1971

I. THE PROBLEM AND ITS HISTORY

Historically, the social position of southern women and the educational system provided for them have been shaped by an image of ideal womanhood inherited from the antebellum plantation South. In the mid-nineteenth century, a "cult of true womanhood" was generally accepted throughout America; middle-class white women were expected to be pure, submissive, pious, domestic, and happily self-sacrificing.[1] The South, however, held to this myth most tenaciously and placed the southern lady on her shaky pedestal, supporting with her the whole moonlight-and-magnolias mystique of the "Old South." Perhaps a society guilty with the burden of slavery found compensation in idolizing the innocence that southern women ideally embodied. As Ellen Glasgow once remarked, the less a woman knew of life, the better she was supposed to deal with it.

Whatever the sources for the southern-lady mystique, it has influenced the behavior of southern men and women (and the self-image of women), despite its lack of basis in fact. Although the aftermath of the Civil War and the many options open to women in the New South had, by the 1930s, shattered the monolithic image of women's role, the old chloroforming myths have never entirely disappeared.

Some of Ellen Glasgow's novels, written in the early twentieth century, portrayed the inheritance of the southern lady with particular relevance to Virginia. Glasgow described one maiden lady of the New South as naturally turning to "teaching as the only nice and respectable occupation which required neither preparation of mind nor considerable outlay of maney." (As we will later see, many women are still advised to teach for reasons that are no more viable.) This lady's honorable Confederate pedigree "was sufficient recommendation of her abilities in the eyes of her fellow citizens." To be feminine was still, as Glasgow saw it, also to "be morally passive . . . never to go out and fight for what we wanted."[2]

This ladylike tradition, prescribing a uniform mode of desirable feminine appearance, behavior, and employment, is still perpetuated by many southern institutions of higher education. Until very recently, coeds at a large state university in Florida were strongly encouraged to attend dormitory functions that taught them to serve and pour tea (from elaborate silver services), greet guests graciously, and otherwise learn to become "proper" hostesses. Rules against going barefoot (even in the dormitory), wearing slacks, or smoking in public were implicitly justified by the belief that the school's obligation to the taxpayers involved making southern ladies of their daughters.

Such practices have been common at southern colleges. They are only a part of a whole educational system that directs women to the more "genteel" majors and womanly professions--teaching, nursing, the arts, and home economics. A separate college experience for women is well defined, even in coeducational institutions, but Virginia has been especially effective in continuing the myth of "woman's place" through its male dominated, racially and sexually separatist system of higher education, which neatly channels women into their "proper" role in our society.

In Virginia, each college and university seems to have been designed to serve a specific slice of the college-bound population, with as little overlap as possible among the institutions. The College of William and Mary, originally private, has provided a coeducational liberal-arts curriculum, but the other "elite" institutions have traditionally provided different sorts of education for the state's men: the University of Virginia, a "classical" university education for superior students; Virginia Military Institute, a combination of higher education and military training; and Virginia Polytechnic Institute, technical training and applied science, primarily for men.

As a later section of this report will show, three of these institutions--U. Va., V.P.I., and William and Mary--have maintained higher salary scales and have thus been able to attract and keep superior professors. They have also provided superior facilities; the University of Virginia library, for example, ranks with

the best in the country. Obviously, Virginia's colleges and universities not only differ in kind, but in the quality of education provided. And white males seem to get the creme de la creme in the Old Dominion.

Within this system of male domination in the major institutions, separate women's colleges have functioned to prepare women for the "feminine" domestic and service professions, or for their "most natural" role of wife-and-mother. Mary Washington has operated in conjunction with the University of Virginia, but it has done so primarily through the U. Va. hospital and nursing department to prepare women for the traditionally female nursing profession. Mary Washington has also maintained a strong education department, and Radford, Longwood, and Madison colleges were all founded as normal schools and have remained primarily teacher training colleges.

All of the above institutions have, until recently, been racially segregated, necessitating a separate Black college system. Consisting of Virginia State College at Petersburg and at Norfolk, the Black system has always been coeducational.

Although sexually, and racially, segregated private and church institutions are national phenomena, only four southern states currently maintain sexually segregated public schools of higher education. Virginia maintains three such institutions--Longwood and Radford colleges for women and VMI for men. (Until recently Madison, Mary Washington, and U. Va. were sexually segregated.) The other states that have such institutions are South Carolina with two--Winthrop College for women in Rock Hill and the Citadel Military College in Charlestown--Mississippi with one, the Mississippi State College for Women in Columbus, and Texas with one, the Texas Women's University in Denton. Aside from VMI and the Citadel, which patriotically aid the Pentagon in educating the officer corps of the future, all identify themselves as colleges for the liberal arts and teacher preparation. All of these women's colleges coexist with other state supported coed institutions which offer the same programs. All of these women's colleges are staffed and administered almost entirely by men. Typically the only female

administrator of any rank is the dean of women. We pass without comment the fact that women enjoy no such hegemony on the administrative staffs of VMI or the Citadel.

How, and why, was this network of sexually segregated schools originally established in Virginia?

The creation of all or predominantly male institutions of higher education reflected the traditional, and until recently, unquestioned male dominance in military, technical, and professional careers. Since its founding in 1839, Virginia Military Institute's all male cadets have followed a "life of uniformity and discipline" in preparation for becoming officers of "citizen soldiers." As the state's land-grant college, Virginia Polytechnic Institute's major objective for most of its one-hundred-year history has been the teaching of agricultural and mechanical arts to an almost exclusively male student body. Although in the last decade VPI has greatly expanded its liberal arts program, and thus attracted more women, in 1969-1970 there were still only 1,742 women in a total student enrollment of 10,478. Sponsored by Thomas Jefferson, the University of Virginia was opened in 1825 as the training school for the male elite of the state. Women undergraduates were excluded from admission until the 1970 court case and only recently admitted to the professional schools after two years of study elsewhere.

The history of the separate women's colleges in the state is a more complicated problem. To regain admittance to the Union, the "Radical Republicans" who controlled Congress after 1867 required Virginia, as well as the other defeated states of the Confederacy, to approve a state constitution which, among other things, provided for free, publicly supported and state-supervised education at the elementary level for all citizens. Former slaveowners, business and professional men, politicians and professors launched a "massive resistance" campaign against public education for Virginians particularly since it involved the state's 30-percent Black population. Education should remain a personal and private matter for

those who could get it, they argued, as was the case before the Civil War. The genuine interests of working people and Blacks in Virginia, contended a leading clergyman and seminary professor, lay in educating the upper-class males, who would uplift the submerged masses.

Despite such opposition, Virginians reluctantly approved the new Constitution of 1870. William H. Ruffner, the first superintendent of public instruction, appointed 1,400 county supervisors to secure schools, hire teachers, and take a census of the school-age population. By the fall of 1870, 130,000 pupils (about one-fourth of those eligible) attended 2,900 public schools and were taught by about 3,000 teachers. Teachers received an average of $32.00 per month for the three to four months in the school year. By 1900 the enrollment had gradually increased to 370,000 (about 40 per cent of the school-age population) taught by some 8,900 teachers.

This modest expansion of public education intensified the problem of obtaining adequately trained teachers. In response to this problem the state in 1884 acquired the Farmville Female Academy and made it the State Female Normal School, now Longwood College. Women completing the two-year curriculum earned various kinds of normal certificates qualifying them to teach in the public schools. Thus Virginia established the pattern of the normal school as the only public higher education for women. Nineteenth-century American mores had approved teaching as a proper womanly occupation in keeping with the "natural" female functions of nurture and service to others. A woman wishing to pursue a B.A. or other degree was forced to attend a private institution or leave the state.

Virginia had the basic laws, officers, and machinery of public education established by 1900, but the schools themselves, especially in the country where the majority of the population lived, were not well attended, well housed, or well taught. Leaders of the industrializing New South and of such foundations as the Peabody, Slater, and Rosenwald, representing northern financial interests, began a drive to increase support for public education. Integrating the South into a

developing national system of corporate capitalism required literate workers, preferably trained at the public's expense. Organized by the Rockefeller-backed Southern Education Board, every phase of public education in Virginia was scrutinized: tax support, length of school terms, the paucity of high schools, Negro education, illiteracy, and the college preparation of teachers. The whole state was involved in the cause of education. At 100 meetings in 1905 Governor A. J. Montegue and other leading figures delivered 300 speeches, distributed more than 200,000 pages of educational literature, and organized 50 citizen's groups.

Out of this movement Virginia passed a series of acts under the 1902 constitution to expand, upgrade, and rationalize the whole system of public education. In 1906 Virginia had only ten free public high schools that offered four years of work. The Mann High School Act provided funds for the construction of more high schools. In 1908 school attendance was made compulsory and the school term lengthened. As in the 1880s the reform of the public schools created a demand for trained teachers. Mary Washington, Radford College, and Madison College were each founded by the state as "Normal and Industrial Schools for Women," in 1908, 1909, and 1910 respectively.

Dominated by upperclass male boards of visitors and by male administrators, women's colleges taught piety, chastity, service, and submission to males. Although functionally necessary as workers, women teachers in Virginia developed a consciousness of themselves as the transmitters of the white, aristocratic, and male-chauvinist values they had been taught in the normal schools. Such consciousness prevented any definition of women teachers as workers, who would organize against their exploitation as cheap labor or who would see themselves as the equals of men in terms of promotions, educational opportunities, or administrative positions.

This then is the educational heritage Virginia offers its women: here, and in several other southern states, a pattern of separate education for white women and Blacks has operated in effect as a tracking system. By "tracking" we mean that students have been directed toward jobs and life-styles on the basis of race, sex, or social status, rather than on their innate abilities or personal preferences. In the case of women, tracking has been accomplished not only by sexual segregation but by guidance and counseling services, dormitory and social regulations, curriculum counseling--only a few examples of a silent, unconsciously accepted web of practices that circumscribe a college-educated woman's life-style and personality. Also, discriminatory hiring and advancement practices have resulted in male-dominated faculties and administrations that both perpetuate tracking and deprive women students of academic-responsible "role models."

Some material in the history section above was from:

1. Barbara Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood," American Quarterly, XVIII (1966), 151-174.
2. Anne Firor Scott, The Southern Lady: From Pedestal to Politics, 1830-1930 (Chicago, 1970), 222.

II. DISCRIMINATION TODAY: FACULTY AND STAFF

Discrimination against women faculty is a notorious fact throughout the United States. Virginia's public colleges and universities are no exception to this pattern. Sexual discrimination in faculty employment, promotions, and salaries within the Virginia college system was well documented in the 1965 staff report #8, (State Council of Higher Education) The Faculties of Virginia's Colleges and Universities. Data in this report is from the 1964 academic year. Later information for 1966-1967 on the number of men and women employed, but not indicating rank or salary, was published in the 1967 report of the Council of Higher Education, Those Employed at Virginia's Colleges. The differences in the data on total employment for the two periods are so small that it is improbable that there have been significant changes since 1964 in the pattern of discrimination in awarding rank and salary.

Total Employment, Full-Time Faculty, 1966-67

Institution	Male No.	Male %	Female No.	Female %
4-Year Colleges & Universities				
George Mason	32	59.3	22	40.7
Longwood	64	54.2	54	45.8
Madison	99	57.6	73	42.4
Mary Washington College	87	58.4	62	41.6
Old Dominion	260	81.2	60	18.8
Radford*	100	54.4	83	45.1
Richmond Professional Inst.**	203	69.8	87	29.9
University of Virginia	542	92.5	44	7.5
Virginia Military Institute	104	100.0	0	0
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	648	94.0	41	6.0
Virginia State, Norfolk	110	56.7	84	43.3
Virginia State, Petersburg	136	64.5	75	35.5
William and Mary	240	83.9	46	16.1
All Four-Year Colleges & Univ.	2,625	78.2	731	21.7
2-Year Colleges				
Community Colleges				
Blue Ridge	33	84.6	6	15.4
Central Valley	9	69.2	4	30.8
D. Lancaster	13	81.2	3	18.8
Danville CC	26	83.9	5	16.1
John Tyler	41	74.5	14	25.5
N. Virginia	52	53.1	46	46.9
Va. Western	49	74.2	17	25.8
Wytheville	15	55.6	12	44.4
All Community Colleges	238	69.0	107	31.0
Branch Colleges				
Christopher Newport	14	50.0	14	50.0
Clinch Valley	22	84.6	4	15.4
Danville	11	91.7	1	8.3
Eastern Shore	13	86.7	2	13.3
Patrick Henry	9	69.2	4	30.8
Richard Bland	18	60.0	12	40.0
All Branch Colleges	87	70.2	37	29.8
All Two-Year Colleges	325	69.3	144	30.7
All Institutions	2,950	77.1	875	22.8

*Sex of one faculty member not indicated.
**Now part of Virginia Commonwealth University. Sex of one faculty member not indicated.
From Those Employed at Virginia's Colleges, Table 11, page 14.

Several points should be noted in the above table. Women do not constitute a majority of the faculty at the state colleges for women; the smallest percentage of women faculty teach at the elite Mary Washington College. The proportion of women faculty at all of the state's elite colleges is shockingly low, especially when

one considers that a large part of the 44 women on the University of Virginia's faculty are concentrated in the school of nursing, while of the 41 women employed by VPI in 1966-67 a majority taught in the home economics department. Since women physical education teachers also accounted for some of the women employed at these institutions, women students were seldom taught by a women in the liberal arts and sciences, nor did such students have the opportunity to learn that women may occupy professional roles in our society.

No effort is being made to substantially change the pattern at the new universities. While George Mason College has 40.7 per cent women on its faculty, Old Dominion University has only 18.8 per cent. Nor is the situation better in the junior colleges. Only two of the eight colleges established in 1966-67 had close to a 50 per cent ratio of women faculty, while only one of the six two-year branch colleges had such a ratio.

Faculty women are discriminated against in promotions. A much higher proportion of women remain in the lower ranks (lecturer, instructor, assistant professor) than men; few women become full professors. The position of women illustrated in the table below is a good example of how the hierarchic system of rank in higher education discriminates against all who lack power and status in the society and distributes rewards of pay and prestige unequally.

Distribution of Faculty by Rank and Sex, Fall, 1964

Sex	Professor No.	Professor %	Associate Professor No.	Associate Professor %	Assistant Professor No.	Assistant Professor %	Instructor No.	Instructor %	Lecturer and Other No.	Lecturer and Other %
4-Year Colleges and Universities										
Men	713	24.3	642	21.9	779	26.5	441	15.0	363	12.4
Women	61	8.5	136	19.0	243	33.8	192	26.7	87	12.2
2-Year Colleges										
Men	7	5.1	15	10.9	32	23.2	49	35.5	35	25.3
Women	0	-	5	10.9	8	17.4	23	50.0	10	21.7

Virginia Higher Education Study Commission, The Faculties of Virginia's Colleges and Universities, (staff report #8), Table 23, page 52.

One of the most obvious ways to measure discrimination between men and women is to compare their salaries.

Average 9-10 Month Faculty Salaries, By Rank and Sex, for the Public Colleges and Universities in Virginia, Fall, 1964

Four-Year Institutions

Academic Rank	Sex	Average Salary		Total Number Reported
Professor	Men	$11,561	$2070.00	399
	Women	9,471		42
Associate Professor	Men	8,790	744	419
	Women	8,046		101
Assistant Professor	Men	7,343	534	465
	Women	6,809		172
Instructor	Men	6,023	436	221
	Women	5,587		111
Lecturer and Other	Men	7,276	1783	33
	Women	5,493		13
All Ranks Combined	Men	8,644	1648	1,537
	Women	6,996		439

Two-Year Colleges

Professor	Men	$9,200		2
	Women	--		--
Associate Professor	Men	8,180	955	10
	Women	7,225		4
Assistant Professor	Men	6,662	25	26
	Women	6,637		8
Instructor	Men	5,860	185	40
	Women	5,675		20
Lecturer and Other	Men	6,663	1013	3
	Women	5,650		2
All Ranks Combined	Men	6,517	435	81
	Women	6,082		34

Virginia Higher Education Study Commission, The Faculties of Virginia's Colleges and Universities, (staff report #8), Tables 65,67, pages 115 and 117.

No data is available to show what is the actual distribution of women faculty in the various departments of colleges and universities. Traditionally more women are hired to staff fields in which enrollment is virtually exclusively female, such as home economics, nursing, women's physical education, early childhood education. National data on Ph.D's granted to women indicate that few women are trained or employed in zoology, pharmacology, music education, educational administration, supervision and finance, music, pharmacy, mathematics, philosophy, chemistry, history, and political science.*

* These are fields in which women earned less than 15 per cent of the doctorates awarded in 1967-68.

The exploitation of and discrimination against women staff (librarians, secretaries, maids, cooks, clerical workers, nurses, waitresses) at colleges and universities is well-known, but difficult to document. No reliable data is published even of the numbers of these nonacademic employees in the statewide system. Their numbers are large, however. 6,204 nonacademic, permanent, full-time civil service workers were employed in the four-year colleges and universities alone in 1970-71. The actual number of nonacademic employees working in the four-year schools also includes numerous other men and women holding positions classified as temporary or part-time.

Women are consistently kept in the lowest job classifications among nonacademic employees and denied opportunity for supervisory jobs. Thus while libraries are staffed largely with women, it is more usual for a man to administer the library. The same situation prevails in the infirmaries, business offices, kitchens, and custodial services. The secretaries who administer departmental offices for a fraction of the pay or status their chairman receives are legion.

The wage scale in Virginia, a state with a very weak union tradition, is low. For example, 1971 Virginia civil service salaries for office clerks range from $3,744-$7,344 per year, for stenographers, $4,320-$7,344. Bookeepers are paid on a similar scale. Cooks receive $3,936-$6,432; dietary unit supervisors earn $4,920-$8,784; food service aides make $3,456-$4,512; while food service directors are paid $11,472-$15,000. Custodial workers earn $3,456-$4,128. Librarians' salaries range from $8,040-$11,472 and those of general duty registered nurses are between $7,344-$8,784. These are the wages of those employees fortunate enough to have permanent, full-time civil service positions. Average wages in the state are probably lower. In the Southern region, in March, 1969, the average hourly earnings of nonacademic, non-administrative employees of public and private colleges and universities was $1.87. This is less than $75.00 per 40 hour week, less than $300.00 per month, or under $3,600 per year.

Many of these employees, being Black, suffer discrimination both of race and of sex. These women come from a variety of educational backgrounds, with a large

number having been denied a decent education by the extremely class-biased (and segregated) public education system. It remains true that the Virginian coming from a poor family has very little chance of getting an adequate education. Essential to the operation of the college or university, yet poorly paid and often poorly treated, staff employees are denied educational benefits of college. There is a large and growing number of adults in the college work force who need and would very much like to have access to a system of real "public" education. When we think of the educational needs of the people, we often restrict ourselves to young people; but ineeed we have neglected a large class of people who are too busy supporting a family to take advantage of the few opportunities which do exist. Most of those are too expensive or are not planned with the real needs of the people in mind.

DISCRIMINATION TODAY: STUDENTS

Virginia's tracked colleges and universities deprive many groups of their fair share of higher education; the most notable are Women, Blacks and the poor. The sexism in admissions during 1969-70 is a typical example of how the system works Three of the state's fifteen four-year colleges are predominantly female: Longwood, Mary Washington, and Radford. These three colleges have a head-count enrollment of 7,738 out of a total enrollment of 70,516 in the fifteen four-year colleges, or about 11.0 per cent. Yet these colleges receive about 5.9 per cent of the state funds. On the other hand, three of the fifteen are predominantly male, the University of Virginia, Virginia Military Institute, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute. The male colleges have an enrollment of 21,212, three times that of the female colleges, or 30.1 per cent of the total for the fifteen. They receive about 48.2 per cent of the state's funds.

Women make up 44.3 per cent of the total enrollment in the fifteen four-year colleges. The prestigious institutions--the University of Virginia, Virginia Military Institute, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Mary Washington, and William and Mary--enroll 32.9 per cent of the female students; the remaining four-year colleges enroll 67.1 per cent of the women. It is clear, therefore, that women are mainly

admitted to the less prestigious Black colleges and the large urban colleges, such as Norfolk State, Virginia Commonwealth University, Virginia State, George Mason, and Old Dominion.

The state has a conscious policy of restricting female access to the state's prestigious colleges. Of the top five colleges, the University of Virginia, Virginia Military Institute, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute are almost exclusively male institutions. Mary Washington, established as an elite women's liberal arts college, enrolls only 2,125 students. William and Mary is thus the only one of the elite colleges with a coeducational student body. But sexism rules at William and Mary also, for the college restricts the admission of female freshmen For example, the college received 880 male and 1,153 female in-state applications, but admitted 63 per cent of the men applying and only 34 per cent of the women. More applications were received from out of the state than from Virginia. 1,282 men and 1,922 women applied, and the college admitted 23 per cent of the men, but again cut the women to only ten per cent. Although three women sought admission for every two men, William and Mary's discriminatory policy made women a minority in the enrolled freshmen: 401 women, 477 men.

It is also remarkable that women especially seek entrance into the state's four-year colleges, rather than the two-year colleges where an open admissions policy would prevent discrimination. In the two-year colleges women compose 34.2 per cent of the enrollment, but they make up 44.3 per cent of that of the four-year colleges.

In comparison, Black women seem to have a better chance in the two predominantly Black colleges, Norfolk State and Virginia State, where they compose 63.1 per cent of the total enrollment. On the other hand, as students at predominantly Black public colleges, they suffer from the inadequate facilities, poorly paid faculty, and general harrassment of Blacks common in most Southern Black colleges. (See our forthcoming report on racism in Virginia higher education.)

III. 1965 STATE PLAN FOR VIRGINIA HIGHER EDUCATION

In 1964 the state of Virginia issued a major policy study and by 1967 had reorganized its system of higher education. This involved reorganization of planning agencies, an increase in appropriations, and a commitment to building a statewide junior college system and to expanding the four-year colleges and universities, primarily those in urban areas. Enrollment was expected to double between 1967 and 1977. In The Virginia Plan For Higher Education the State Council of Higher Education published the future plans for each of the 28 public colleges and universities in operation in 1967. Nothing so well illustrates the discriminatory policies of the State Council as this report. It had hardly been printed when complaints and court cases began.

While planning for the next ten years, the state's officials never considered abolishing either the sexual or racial discrimination that are an integral part of Virginia's colleges and universities.** The state plan explicitly states the intention to preserve the sexist and racist traditions long accepted as the basis of education in the state.

Only two exceptions altered the pattern of sexual segregation: Madison College was opened to men (remaining primarily a teacher training school) and Virginia Polytechnic Institute was expected to admit "many more women students" as it expanded from 9,421 students in 1967 to 18,000 in 1977.

In contrast to the plans for VPI, those for the University of Virginia did not mention the possibility of admitting women undergraduates. In 1970 in response to the court order to admit women,* the General Assembly deleted from law any reference to the school as a male institution. For 1970-71, 450 undergraduate women have been admitted to the University, part of

* See part IV of this report.

** Although the 1965 Study Commission of the General Assembly recommended that all new schools established by the state be coeducational, the rationale for coeducation was not applied to the existing schools.

the 2,000 women in a total enrollment of 10,800. The University Board of Visitors has agreed to admit women on exactly the same basis as men beginning in September, 1972.

Three of the public women's colleges, Radford, Longwood, and Mary Washington, were to remain static relics of the past with little increase in enrollment. Radford, the largest of the three, was to expand from 3,594 (1967) to 5,500 (1977), while increasing the scope of its undergraduate and masters programs in teacher education. Longwood College, with 1,737 students in 1967 and 2,200 projected in 1977, was to "continue to concentrate on its teacher education role," but to drop its masters degree program. Mary Washington College was to continue as the elite college providing a liberal arts education for 2,100 to 2,300 highly selected girls. In 1970 the act ending sexual segregation at the University of Virginia also made Mary Washington a coeducational college. Unless substantial affirmative actions are taken to attract men, however, this women's residential college will retain its segregated character. The report in December, 1970, of an Ad Hoc Committee to consider the structure of the college does not indicate that coeducation is one of Mary Washington's goals.

The conservatism of the state plan is especially evident in the report on Virginia Military Institute. "The State Council of Higher Education recognizes the value of and wishes to preserve the distinctive character and specialized function of this distinguished institution." Accepting the wishes of VMI's Board of Visitors, the school is to remain an elite military college for men with no projected increase in enrollment.

Under the plan, the major expansion in enrollment is to be at the new, coeducational junior colleges and four-year universities. But, in setting up these schools, no thought was given to the needs of women students or to correcting the pattern of discrimination against women faculty that was

documented in the Council's 1965 staff studies. Nor did the plan take into account the need to improve wages and working conditions of the staff throughout Virginia's colleges and universities.

The Virginia Plan for Higher Education was written only three years ago. Events have caught up with it so rapidly that it is now obsolete as more than a guide to the thoughts of those who dominate higher education in Virginia.

One important note--often in the cases in which state agencies do recommend changes in the existing system, they do so for the wrong reasons. Their "improvements," such as equalization in the admission of women, attack only a small part of the tracking system and may eventually entrench and perpetuate it. For example, opening schools to women can be done for explicitly elitist reasons: The Woody Commission report to the president of the University of Virginia advocated the admission of women, especially Virginia women, as a way of opposing pressures to open the university to more men by lowering admission standards. A similar argument was used in the early twentieth century to support woman suffrage. Give the middle-class ladies the vote, argued the conservative suffragists, and their ballots will cancel out those of Negroes and the immigrant-American "hoi polloi."

IV. LEGAL CRITIQUE OF THE STATE PLAN AND PRESENT SITUATION.

The legal basis for demanding sexual desegration in Virginia higher education has up to this time hinged on the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause and Executive Order 11246, issued by President Johnson in 1965, which forbids dimcrimination by all federal contractors on the basis of

race color, religion, or national origin. This order was amended, effective October,1968, by Executive Order 11375 to include discrimination based on sex. Beyond that, laws at the federal level regarding sexual discrimination in higher education are nonexistent. Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which prohibits discrimination against women in employment specifically exempts educational institutions in their "educational activities", which means faculty, professional staff, and administrators, although placement service and non-academic staff are covered. Also, the Equal Pay Act of 1963 excludes executives, professionals, and administrators from its provisions. Finally, the Civil Rights Commission is currently ineffective in this area because it has no jurisdiction whatsoever over sexual discrimination.

While there are no federal regulations concerning admission to colleges and universities, the Equal Protection Clause has been used successfully in guaranteeing equal admission for women to the University of Virginia. The basic attack in the Kirstein case against the University of Virginia was the assertion that the Equal Protection Clause prohibits any form of invidious discrimination against women. The court accepted this position and ruled "that the Commonwealth of Virginia may not now deny to women on the basis of sex, educational opportunities at the Charlottesville campus that are not afforded in other institutions operated by the state." However, no action was taken against the University as the court held that the Board of Visitors' admissions plan for the admission of women on an equal basis with men was constitutional. This plan sets up a three-stage procedure for altering admissions policies -- (1) 450 women were to be admitted in September, 1970, (2) in September, 1971, 550 additional women are to be admitted, and (3) women will be admitted on exactly the same basis as men beginning in 1972 with no limitation thereafter on the number of women admitted. Unfortunately, the court declined "to go further and to hold that Virginia may not operate any educational institutions separated according to the sexes." It should also be noted that a similar suit based on the Fourteenth

Amendment brought by men seeking admission to all girls Winthrop College, a state supported school in South Carolina, was unsuccessful.

The Women's Equity Action League (WEAL) has been responsible for two actions pending against Virginia Commonwealth University and the College of William and Mary based on Executive Order 11246, as amended by Executive Order 11375. These orders apply to all federal contractors and subcontractors. Consequently, maintains WEAL, all universities and colleges having federal contracts or grants are subject to their provisions and must practice non-discrimination in all aspects of their employment activity. WEAL is also stressing the point that undergraduate and graduate admissions policies are analogous to the apprenticeship programs of industry. Perhaps the most significant feature of these Orders is that contractors (universities) are required to take affirmative actions wherever necessary to remedy the effects of past discrimination and to counteract discriminatory practices by offering equal employment opportunity. At this time nothing substantial has resulted from the WEAL action against these two Virginia institutions

As for anti-nepotism rules, usually interpreted to prevent the hiring of husband and wife in the same college or department, the abuses are again manifold. In the summer of 1970, Virginia Attorney General Andrew P. Miller ruled that the state's conflict of interest law made employment of married couples in the same school division illegal. This ruling was extended to other closely related persons living in the same households if either of the parties earned in excess of $5,000. An injunction, which bars enforcement of the law as it relates to state educational employees, unless one of the parties is in a direct administrative or supervisory position over the other, was obtained and will remain in force until the General Assembly clarifies the law.

The effect of this law in a male-dominated society and educational system is to discriminate against faculty and administrative wives Most administrative positions are now held by men and men faculty members are obviously favored in

employment. To be equitable Virginia's colleges and universities must not limit their hiring on the basis of marital relations. It is recommended that the General Assembly clarify the present law so that state colleges are not compelled to choose between husband and wife. In turn, each institution should have its own policy statement, making it unacceptable for employment decisons to be based on the marital relationship.

The state must make this position clear to prevent college administrations from initiating discriminatory actions on their own, as in the case of George Mason College of the University of Virginia (Fairfax). According to a complaint filed with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare by the National Organization of Women, Lorin A. Thompson, Chancellor of George Mason, refused to renew the contract of Dr. Lorraine A. Brown because of an anti-nepotism rule imposed on the college by the University of Virginia. Dr. Brown is an Assistant Professor in the Department of English. While a faculty member, in July, 1969, she was married to Dr. Stephen Brown, Associate Dean of the college. Dr. Stephen Brown has since resigned his position as Associate Dean, but intends to remain in his position as full professor in the Department of English. Dr. Lorraine Brown has been notified that her contract with the college will not be extended beyond June, 30, 1971. The state should make clear to all state colleges and universities that hiring and firing decisions should be based on professional qualifications, not marital relationships.

V. THE STRUCTURE OF MALE DOMINANCE IN VIRGINIA HIGHER EDUCATION

By its silence in the 1967 master plan, the Virginia State Council of Higher Education projected the continuation of sexist discrimination of faculty and students into the decade of the 1970s. The exclusion of educators from the protection of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the inadequate enforcement of Executive Orders #11246 and #11375 and the failure of the courts in the recent University of Virginia case to make more than a token gesture towards equal rights for women has resulted in no significant alteration in the existing pattern of discrimination nor change in policy by the State Council. The long tradition of male control of the entire apparatus of higher education in Virginia is the principal source of resistance to a program of sexual equality, abetted, as it is, by federal inaction at every level.

The starting point for a critique of this structure is the State Council. Established in 1956 to promote a "sound, vigorous, progressive, and coordinated system of higher education" the State Council is the chief policy-making body for state colleges. It has responsibilities ranging over finances, curriculum, admissions, desegregation, establishing new colleges, and so on. There are now 10 members to the Council appointed by the Governor to staggered four-year terms as well as the Superintendent of Public Instruction, who serves ex officio. The present Council is composed of 10 males and 1 female. The profiles of the Council members since 1968 indicate that the principal qualification for appointment is not experience in education but professional, political, and especially corporate connections. These worlds are notoriously male dominated, and such domination is transferred into the control of higher education. (See appendix II for profiles of Council members.)

Although the original statutes establishing the State Council provided it with the authority to review the biennial budget requests of the state colleges, riders to the general appropriation bill since 1960 have nullified this authority and, according to the 1965 Study Commission, greatly hamstrung the work of the Council. Real control over educational institutions still rests, therefore, with the boards of visitors of the various colleges. As with the State Council, membership on a board of visitors is by appointment of the Governor, and professional, political and

corporate careers in Virginia appear to be prerequisites for the job. A quick glance at the roster of a few boards of visitors is sufficient to indicate the overwhelming male control of higher education in Virginia. Of the 17 Visitors of the University of Virginia, 2 are women. Such male dominance is compounded by the fact that Mary Washington is under the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia. William & Mary College has 17 males and 2 females on its Board. Thomas Nelson Community College has a 10-man local Board.

Turning to the internal control over state institutions of higher education, the familiar pattern of male dominance is present. There is no female president of any college in the state, including the women's colleges. At the University of Virginia there are 5 male vice-presidents and no females; there are 13 male deans and 2 female deans, Dean of Women and Dean of the School of Nursing. Of the 25 key administrators at William & Mary, the Dean of Women is the only female. At Thomas Nelson only the Coordinator of Library Services is listed among the 16 administrators as a female. Even at Mary Washington College there are more male than female administrators.

The routine impact of such male domination of the State Council, the boards of visitors and college administrations is psychologically, sexually and economically damaging to women students and faculty and creates false sex-role stereotypes among men in higher education.

VI RECOMMENDATIONS

A. State Council of Higher Education, Boards of Visitors, Administrations

The pattern of sexist discrimination of faculty and students in Virginia higher education is largely a product of the male control of the State Council of Higher Education, the Boards of Visitors, and college administrations. The changes in existing practices related to faculty and students suggested in this section of recommendations are important first steps in challenging the most overt aspects of paternalistic education. But such reforms, by themselves, can be absorbed and tolerated, if only to be later abused, unless accompanied by changes that will democratize the

essentially WASP, aristocratic, corporate, and male control of the structure of Virginia higher education. Until democratic control of higher education in Virginia is a reality, NUC therefore demands the following reforms:

1. The next five appointments to the State Council be women, including three Black and three working class women. Thereafter, at least 50 per cent of the State Council membership should be women. Future male appointments should also come from other segments of society than the corporate elite.

2. The boards of visitors of every state college should be reconstituted by 1974 so that at least 50 per cent of the membership is female, including the boards of Virginia Military Institute, the University of Virginia, and Virginia Polytechnical Institute. Mary Washington College should have its own Board of Visitors similarly constituted.

3. The State Council should take affirmative and immediate action to promote the hiring and advancement of women administrators throughout the state system through special fellowships, internships, day care facilities and so on.

4. Representative bodies of women students at state colleges, by majority vote, should have the power to veto any appointment to the State Council, to their own board of visitors, or to their own college administration which they deem objectionable on sexist grounds. Such vetoes must be accompanied by a full report of the reasons for the objection.

5. The Governor should establish a Women's Rights Bureau to advise on all aspects of sex discrimination in state agencies and higher education in particular. The Bureau, to be headed by a woman and adequately funded from general revenues, will enforce all policies designed to eliminate discrimination against women in higher education.

B. Separate Women's and Men's Colleges

One of the most flagrant forms of sexist discrimination in Virginia is the maintenance of separate women's and men's colleges. At women's colleges course offerings and degree programs are more limited, faculty salaries are inferior, and school facilities are inadequate by comparison to predominantly male or coeducational institutions having equivalent admissions requirements. This situation largely reflects the primary function of women's colleges, which is to train teachers for the state's public school system. Teaching is supposed to be a "woman's job" and consequently less demanding, creative or important than better paid men's jobs. Moreover, the boards of visitors, administrations, and faculties of the women's colleges are male dominated.

The only all-male school, Virginia Military Institute, is an educational anachronism. Even within the context of military academies, there appears no rationale

except the weight of tradition for a state-supported military school whose graduates serve in the United States Army. By excluding women from its student body and faculty, VMI perpetuates male chauvism among its graduates. At the predominatly male schools, the University of Virginia amd Virginia Polytechnical Institute, similar male chauvinism and sex-role stereotypes prevail, and women faculty and students are notoriously ill-treated. NUC therefore demands the following:

1. Radford and Longwood colleges should be made coeducational by 1974.

2. Virginia Military Institute should be totally reorganized as a coeducational liberal arts college by 1974.

3. The State Council should reaffirm and act upon its intention of making the University of Virginia, Virginia Polytechnical Institute, Madison College, and Mary Washington College truely coeducational by 1974.

C. Faculties.

In the hiring, promotion, and treatment of women faculty the state of Virginia is perpetuating a tradition of outright discrimination. Women faculty in state-supported four-year colleges are only 21.7 per cent of the total, and the proportion is even less at the larger and more prestigious schools. Even the women's colleges do not have a majority of female faculty members. If women are to gain their rightful place in Virginia higher education, drastic measures must be taken. Though quota systems have been used, by and large, as instruments of oppression, there may be no other way to achieve sex equality on the faculties of Virginia's colleges. NUC therefore demands the following:

1. Women should be actively recruited and hired so that by 1975 they fill at least one-half of the available positions in Virginia colleges and universities.

2. Equal representation with men in the top academic ranks is not a desirable step toward ending sexism. Instead of demanding equity for women in a hierarchy of rank and tenure, we demand on behalf of all faculty, men and women, and of all students, the abolition of rank and tenure. Equalization of pay throughout the university or college; recognition of the dignity of all work, instead of status by Ph.D; and shared responsibility for hiring and retention of faculty among those affected (all faculty and students) should be our goals.

3. Department chairmanships and other positions with academic administrative responsibilities should be filled on the basis of election and rotation with men and women sharing these burdens equally.

4. Until they are eliminated, women's collegs should have a completely female faculty just as Virginia Military Institute has an all male faculty. As the women's

colleges become coeducational,men should fill the same percentage of faculty positions as indicated by the proportion of male students enrolled in the college.

5. Because Virginia's nepotism law is most often used to dismiss or refuse to hire women faculty whose only disqualification is a husband teaching at the same school, the nepotism law should be immediately repealed by the General Assembly.

6. The State Council should establish a program and timetable to investigate and correct discrimination against women faculty in tenure, salaries, teaching loads, benefits, assignment of assistants, and office help.

D. Students

Given the organization of American higher education one of the most oppressed groups within the university are women students. The traditional male and female sex roles penalize women students in recruitment, admissions, financial aid, and social life, meanwhile channeling them into women's professions. NUC therefore demands the following:

1. State colleges should extend all minority recruiting programs to women, especially in the traditionally "male" professions of medicine, engineering, law, and business management.

2. The qualifications for college entrance must be made equitable for males and females.

3. No woman should be denied equal admission, scholarship or financial aid on the grounds of sex, marriage, or pregnancy.

4. State colleges should abolish "no part time enrollment" policies as discriminatory to women.

5. All rules specifically governing the actions and beliefs of female college students should be immediately revoked.

6. State colleges should make inexpensive housing available to women students without the right to coerce students into that housing. Women students should have the right to govern their own housing units as they see fit, subject only to the laws of the state and the nation.

E. Non-academic Employees

The state colleges and universities are not made up merely of faculty, students, and administrators,but include thousands of non-academic employees. A large number of these employees are women, consigned to the lowest paid and most alienating campus jobs. Secretaries, cafeteria workers, maids and other female staff have been denied adequate educational opportunity and job status because of class, racial, and sexual discrimination. NUC therefore demands the following:

1. Non-academic employees must be guaranteed occupational dignity and living wages either through a recognized labor union or a freely elected governing and administrative body.

2. The state colleges should inaugurate appropriate literacy, vocational and liberal arts courses in a Continuing Education Program for their non-academic employees.

3. Non-academic employees should be given up to 10 hours of paid work time a week to enroll in tuition-free continuing education courses.

4. Female applicants for non-academic employment should receive consideration commensurate with their qualifications and the concept of male and female job classifications should be eliminated through changes in recruitment procedures.

5. All female non-academic employees who possess qualifications equal to or exceeding those of male employees occupying higher level positions should be given primary consideration for promotion to higher level positions.

F. Freedom of Women from Biological Penalties

Women administrators, faculty, students and staff, while discriminated against in different ways and to different degrees, confront a common cultural attitude: that a woman's unique biological ability to bear children entitles her to only partial education or secondary employment status. By not moving to combat such attitudes, and the resulting practices, the system of higher education in Virginia sanctions what recent scholarship has shown to be patently false notions of female capabilities. The state colleges, therefore, bear a particular responsibility to initiate programs, no matter how expensive or far reaching, which will relieve women of the penalties their biology exacts. NUC therefore demands the following:

1. Complete parent-controlled child care facilities, free to children of all members of the college community from birth to 12 years, to include educational programs and to be open 24 hours a day.

2, Maternity leave, paid and for six weeks, should be granted to all members of the college community. No loss of job, status, benefits, or seniority should be imposed upon contracting to return to work after a maternity leave.

3. Expanded medical services for college women to include gynecological examination, complete birth control couseling and prescription and abortion counseling and care.

VII CURRICULUM

Redress of grievances in areas such as admissions should not be the only focus of the plan to eliminate sexual discrimination in Virginia higher education. An

affirmative educational program for both men and women is also needed to overcome the effect of years of sexist bias in Virginia's schools. Existing courses can be changed and new courses, taught by women, must be offered to provide all students with opportunities to increase their understanding of the role of women in our society. Control over the content of these courses must be shared among the faculty and women students participating in them.

The ways in which these curriculum changes are made will depend on the nature and departmental structure of each college or university. Schools and departments of education should offer courses investigating the role socialization of women and the impact of formal education on it. Study of the legal status of women and its implications should be a part of the law school's curriculum. Programs training doctors, nurses and other medical personnel should deal with the position of women in health services both as patients and personnel; courses on the special health needs of women should be available at all levels of medical training. In the area of social sciences these courses might be offered: status of women under various economic systems; women in comparative cultures; contemporary issues in the liberation of women; socialization process of women; the psychology of self-actualization of women. Whenever possible, courses in all areas should be action-oriented. Credit should be given for planning and participating in day care centers, free schools, women's health centers and legal aid centers, for researching the policy and planning practices of public and private agencies as they relate to women, and for organizing to eliminate discrimination against women.

Since every college offers courses in history and literature, a more detailed plan for each of these areas has been included. (Appendix I).

APPENDIX I

Women and the English Curriculum

English departments have not neglected women as severely as have other academic departments. Indeed, in the study of the novel, women occupy an important position, which is generally reflected in the curricula of most departments. The nature of literature itself has made it impossible for scholars and teachers to neglect women thoroughly, since male writers have made extensive use of women and their problems as artistic material. As a group, however, women generally occupy a minor position in literature, and on this basis are often overlooked as an area of special study. In general, male writers, because they have traditionally dominated the field, are held up as the standard by which women are judged. Sexist attitudes as revealed in literature have received little attention, in spite of the fact that those attitudes have been a significant obstacle to the success of women writers.

English departments should begin a re-evaluation of women's position in literature and an examination of attitudes toward women revealed in literature by adding courses which deal with the status of women and the reflection of this status in literature. In part, the addition of such courses will be regarded as a response to the current interest in sexism. Many teachers and scholars will object on the grounds that curriculum changes should not be based on fashionable trends of the day. For the past 20 years, however, the effect of new criticism and mythic criticism has been such that the English curriculum has withdrawn in large part from social issues. Literature must not be studied in a social vacuum. The connection between literature and social conditions cannot be overlooked without impairing our understanding of literature's development and of social change.

An English department preparing to open its curriculum to a study of women and literature, feminism in literature, or similar topics must confront the problem of conventional curriculum structuring. Most departments arrange courses according to historical periods, individual writers, genres or critical modes. Special attention to women can fit into this structure only through an individual teacher's efforts

to explore the feminist and anti-feminist aspects of the course he is teaching. Many courses lend themselves quite easily to this approach. A course in the Victorian period, for example, might consider the reasons for the sudden flowering of talent among women writers, the attitudes of major figures in the period toward women and their social roles, and the emergence of feminism as it is reflected in the literature. Similarly, a course in the writings of one major figure, be it Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, or Chaucer, can take up significant questions related to sexism or feminism. Milton, for example, makes a very clear distinction between sex roles in Paradise Lost. An analysis of this distinction can contribute a great deal to our understanding of women's status in society and in later literature. A course in the novel can also be opened up to the problem of sexism or feminism. Two of the earliest novels--Moll Flanders and Clarissa--deal specifically with women and the social problems surrounding them. These problems need not be discussed as if they were limited to their own times. Indeed, their survival as great literature is due in part to their universal application even today. Many possibilities are available through this method of integrating sexist and teaching issues into existing courses.

Other structural techniques are needed, however, if any current problem is to receive adequate focus. A freshman English course, an upper-level seminar, or "topics" course organized around a general theme which cuts across historical periods, genres, writers and critical approaches is easily adaptable to current social issues, one of which should certainly be that of women's role in society.

Since most departments offer several sections of freshman English, it would be possible to allow each faculty member teaching the course to choose a topic of current interest and select pertinent readings on this topic. Each freshman would then be able to choose from among a variety of topical issues. A freshman course dealing with the current problems of women might be organized around the general themes of sexism, feminism in America, women's social status, or whatever other approach the teacher and students wish to employ. A popular anthology such as Sisterhood Is Powerful might be used as a starting point. This book is especially

useful for the variety of academic disciplines through which the position of women is viewed. The quality of writing ranges from poor to excellent and provides models for stylistic criticism, logical analysis, and personal revelation. In addition, the book includes a useful bibliography of writings on women. Other possible anthologies are American Women: The Changing Image, Up From the Pedestal: Selected Documents From the History of American Women, and The Black Woman.

An upper level course can be organized in several ways. A rotating seminar on women and literature might be offered each semester. The department's medievalist might consider women in the medieval romance one semester; a specialist in the novel might consider the novel as a feminine art form in another semester; a specialist in 20th century literature might explore the prevailing attitudes of and toward women in the literature of this period. An upper level "topics" course is easily adaptable to a study of women and literature. Possible topics to be considered include "The Changing Status of Women as Seen in Literature," "Feminist Literature," "Anti-Feminist (or Sexist) Literature," "Sex and the Novel," and "Marriage and the Family as Seen in the Novel. Obviously, many similar approaches are possible and ought to be encouraged.

A department which adapts its curriculum to include the issues of this proposal will not only enrich the study of literature itself but will contribute to present understanding of women's status in society. Adoption of this proposal by an English department will also mark a step toward opening up literature to social issues.

A bibliography of literature relevant to courses on women can be obtained from the Peninsula NOW chapter.

History of American Women.

As part of an affirmative program to overcome the effect in both men and women of years of sexual discrimination in Virginia's schools, a one semester course in the history of American women should, as a minimum, be added to the curriculum of large history departments or some of the topics integrated into existing courses at schools with a limited number of upper division courses. At the present time, women so scarcely appear in the content of history classes that one could more easily imagine they never existed than believe they have constituted half the country's population. This treatment is, of course, a reflection of the values of our society, rather than a measure of women's contributions to American history.

The objection may be made, as it was when courses in Black history were first proposed, that women have no history worth considering. If the measure is the number of books published in the past thirty years, then that objection might stand. But, if we look instead at the history written between 1900-1930, we will see that American once thought topics about women worthy of serious study and publication. And it appears that we are near the beginning of another cycle of interest in the subject, so that more books and republication of older works can be expected.

But, a better measure of the worth of women's history is to consider some topics that might be studied and then to judge the value of the subject in enlarging students' awareness of the past and possibilities for the future. The need for greater consciousness of women's changing roles in society is particularly necessary in southern schools whose acceptance of a subordinant position for women is reflected in the existence of sexually segregated public colleges in 1970. In such a situation, the addition of a few more pages in textbooks or occasional treatment by perceptive historians in regular courses cannot substitute for thorough exploration. The course outline which follows is a suggestion of one way in which such a course might be structured. A supplementary bibliography of readings related to each of the topics in the outline may be obtained from the Peninsula NUC chapter.

History of American Women

Text: Eleanor Flexner, Century of Struggle*
Supplementary readings: Caroline Bird, Born Female*, Toni Cade, The Black Woman*, Betty Friedan The Feminine Mystique* Anne F. Scott, The American Woman*, Aileen S. Kraditor, The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920.
* available in paperback edition.
Bibliographies: Mary R. Beard, Woman as a Force in History; Robin Morgan, ed., Sisterhood Is Powerful; New University Conference Women's Caucus, "A Selected Bibliography."

Course Outline

I. Introductory Survey of Changing Status of Women in America
   - Legal disabilities
   - Political rights
   - Education and the professions
   - Employment

II. Feminism
   - Equal rights and abilities
   - Conservative feminism
   - Moral superiority of women

III. Anti-feminists

IV. Women and Religion
   - Utopian religious thought and women
   - Puritans: Anne Hutchinson
   - Quakers
   - Women in revivals
   - Service to the church: the ministry, WCTU
   - Elizabeth Cady Stanton: The Woman's Bible
   - Catholic women and workers

V. Historical Relationships of Woman's and Black Movements
   - Southern women's inheritance of slaves
   - Abolition and women's rights
   - Women in reconstruction
   - Nativism, racism, and suffragists
   - Segregation and integration in women's organizations
   - 1960's: civil rights, black power and women's liberation

VI. The Industrial Revolution's Impact on Women
   - Women's status prior to industrialization
   - Women workers: factories, sweatshops, unions
   - Women workers: professionals, academics, office workers, clerks
   - Women in the home: consumerism and the changing technology of housework

VII. The Family
   - Demographic studies
   - Marriage, divorce, the home
   - Attitudes toward children, abortion, and birth control
   - The Black family slavery and after
   - The middle class family
   - The lower class family

VIII. Revolutionary Women
   - Socialists
   - Anarchists
   - "The Longest Revolution"

IX. Problems of Working Women
   - Identity crises: Freud, femininity, motherhood, neurosis
   - Housework: two jobs or shared responsibility
   - Access to jobs
   - Women and the welfare state: daycare, taxes, welfare, medical care

APPENDIX II

Profiles of Members of the State Council of Higher Education of Virginia, 1968-1972

Joseph E. Blackburn -- no information available.

Mrs. Dorothy N. Cowling -- Director of the Division of Education and Psychology at Virginia Union University. Appointed by Governor Holton, she is the first Black woman to serve on the Council. Mrs. Cowling taught at Virginia State from 1947 to 1955 and joined the faculty of Virginia Union in 1955. She is an active member of state and national education associations and is a consultant in General Education for HEW. She holds the B.S. degree from Virginia State, the M.A. degree from Columbia, and the Ed.D. from Lehigh.

Albert M. Miller - Executive Vice President of the U.S. Shelter Corporation, a wholly owned subsidiary of Stirling Homex Corporation. Appointed by Governor Holton, he is the first Black man to serve on the Council. Mr. Miller has worked for the Internal Revenue Service, FHA, and several Alexandria real estate corporations. He is on the Board of Directors of the Washington Urban League and on the Board of Trustees of St. Augustine's College and the Protestant Episcopal Seminary. He is a member of the Virginia State Bar Association. Mr. Miller received his A.B. from St. Augustine's College and his law degree from Howard University.

David N. Montague -- partner in the law firm of Montague and Montague, Hampton. Appointed by Governor Holton he was the first vice-chairman of the Republican Party of Virginia. His law firm is general counsel for such firms as Citizens and Marine Bank, Tidewater Home and Savings Association, and Peninsula Ports Authority The firm is local counsel for VEPCO, the State Highway Commission, Holiday Inn, and Virginia Steel, Inc. Mr. Montague is president of the Hampton Retail Merchants Association and active in the Rotary Club, Peninsula United Fund, and the Hampton Institute Fund. He is on the Board of Editors of the Virginia Lawyer. Mr. Montague received his B.A. and law degree from the University of Virginia.

C. Wesley Peebles -- President and Treasurer of Peebles Department Store, Lawrenceville Mr. Peebles is a member of the board of Brunswick County Development Corporation and three other corporations. Appointed by Governor Godwin, he served as a member of the Stanley Tax Study Commission and the Virginia Technical College Board. Mr. Peebles holds a B.A. from VMI and a law degree from LaSalle University.

Ramsey D. Potts -- partner in the law firm of Shaw, Pittman, Potts, Trowbridge, and Madden of Washington. The firm is active in aviation, insurance, government contract, international and atomic energy law. Mr Potts has been Special Assistant to the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board and to the Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He was Associate Counsel to the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on the Air Force. Mr. Potts holds the rank of Major General in the Air Force Reserve and the position of Assistant to the Commander of the Continental Army Command. He holds a B.S. degree from the University of North Carolina and a law degree from Harvard.

John D. Richmond -- Superintendant of Martinsville City Schools. No other information available.

John F. Rixey -- Senior partner in the law firm of Rixey and Rixey specializing in banking, insurance, labor, and admiralty law. Some representative clients are American Fidelity Fire Insurance Company, American Oil Company, First National Bank of Norfolk, Chrysler Motor Corp., Hanover Insurance Company, Atlantic and Gulf Stevedores, Inc., and Old Dominion Freight Lines. Mr. Rixey was a member of

the Virginia Legislature from 1954-1959 and an unsuccessful Democratic primary candidate for Congress in 1968. He is Chairman of the Board of the First National Bank of Norfolk and General Counsel and Secretary of Norfolk Professional Sports, Inc. He received his B.A. and law degrees from U. Va.

Paul D. Sanders - Executive Vice President of the Southern Planter and formerly its editor. Mr. Sanders worked for the U.S. Agriculture Dept. as an extension entomologist. He is a director of the Bank of Virginia and a member of the board of C & P Telephone Co., Fuel Oils, Inc., and the Atlantic Rural Exposition. He has served on the Board of Visitors of VPI and on the Governor's Council on the Virginia Economy. Mr. Sanders holds the Ph.D. in entomology from Harvard. He is listed in Who's Who in America.

Edward P. Simpkins -- judge of the 15th judicial Circuit Court of Virginia and senior partner in a Richmond law firm. Mr. Simpkins served 12 years as Commonwealth Attorney for Hanover County and was chairman of the Hanover County Democratic Committee. He is director of the Tri-County Bank, Inc. and served as a member of the Board of Visitors of William and Mary. Mr. Simpkins received his B.A. from Wm. & Mary and a law degree from Harvard. He is listed in Who's Who in Amer

Robert L. Teeter -- Assistant Director of Corporate Planning for Reynolds Metals and Director of Alumino Del Caroni-Venezuela. Mr. Teeter is a member of the National Defense Executive Reserve and other professional associations. He holds a B.S. degree from Kansas State, an M.S. from VPI, and a law degree from U. Va.

William A. Trapnell -- Director of C & P Telephone Co. Mr. Trapnell has served with C & P Telephone Co. since 1927 as traffic supervisor, vice president, and general manager. He is president of Commonwealth Natural Gas Co., chairman of the board of Portsmouth Gas Co., and a director of WRVA-TV, Virginia Wood Preserving Co., and the First and Merchants National Bank and Life Insurance Co. of Va. Mr. Trapnell holds a B.S. from Hobart College and is listed in Who's Who in America.

Woodrow W. Wilkerson -- Superintendant of Public Instruction of Virginia. Mr. Wilkerson worked as a teacher and an administrator in Prince Edward County public schools. He serves as an ex officio member of the Council.

* By an act of the 1970 General Assembly, the State Council was expanded from nine to eleven members. Mr. Trapnell's and Mr. Peebles' terms of office expired in 1970.

** The sources for these biographical sketches were Newsletters of the State Council of Higher Education; Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory, Vol. IV; Who's Who in the South; and Who's Who in America.